

## REMARKS

Applicants have studied the Final Office Action dated July 26, 2006, and have made amendments to the claims. Claims 20-24, 30-35 and 37-39 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 25-29, 36, 41 and 42 have been amended. Claims 1-19 have been allowed. No new matter has been added. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### Claim Objections

Claim 30 was objected to because of the following informality: In the second line of the claim, the word "lacking" should be "latching". With this paper, claim 30 has been canceled without prejudice. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to claim 30 is now moot.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 20, 25 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,490,436 to Kaiwa et al. (hereinafter "Kaiwa et al."). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With this paper, claim 20 has been canceled without prejudice. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection with respect to claim 20 is now moot.

With respect to claim 36, the applicants respectfully point out that on page 7 of the present Office Action, the examiner indicated that claim 39 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the limitations of claim 39 and its intervening claims have been incorporated into claim 36 (claim 39's base claim). In view of this, it is respectfully submitted that claim 36, as amended, and the claims dependent from claim 36 are in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 25, the applicants respectfully assert that the claim has been amended to incorporate limitations similar to those found in amended claim 36, which the applicant believes to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 25, as amended, and the claims dependent from claim 25 are now in condition for allowance.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 21-24, 26-29, 30, 32-38 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaiwa et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,371,535 to Wei et al. (hereinafter "Wei et al."). Furthermore, claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaiwa et al., Wei et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,785,567 to Kato (hereinafter "Kato"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With this paper, claims 21-24, 30-35 and 38 have been canceled without prejudice. Therefore, the § 103(a) rejections with respect to these claims is now moot.

With respect to claims 26-29, it is respectfully submitted that these claims depend from independent claim 25. As argued above, claim 25, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Thus, by virtue of their dependence on claim 25, claims 26-29 are also in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 40, it is respectfully submitted that this claim depends from independent claim 36. As argued above, claim 36, as amended is in condition for allowance. Thus, by virtue of its dependence on claim 36, claim 40 is also in condition for allowance.

### Allowed Claims

The examiner has previously indicated claims 1-19 to be allowable. Accordingly, the applicant acknowledges and thanks the examiner for the allowance of these claims.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, applicants submit that the present Amendment places all claims of the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.


No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: October 26, 2006

By:   
Lew Edward V. Macapagal  
Registration No. 55,416  
Attorney(s) for Applicant

Customer No. 035884

LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & SCHMADEKA  
801 South Figueroa Street, Twelfth Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
Telephone: (213) 623-2221  
Facsimile: (213) 623-2211  
Email: patent@lhlaw.com